

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 and 8-19 remain pending.

**Claims 1-6 and 8-19 under 35 USC 112**

Claims 1-6 and 8-19 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for including language relating to reception of a dial tone allegedly not supported by the specification. It is respectfully pointed out that such feature is well known in the art as this is how telephone calls such as 9-1-1 are conventionally made on a cordless telephone, i.e., after pressing a TALK or ON button and receiving a dial tone. Thus, since this knowledge is known by those of ordinary skill in the art, it need not be detailed in the present specification.

Nevertheless, in order to move prosecution of the present application forward, the language relating to reception of a dial tone is canceled herein, thereby mooting the rejection. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claims 1-6 and 8-19 over Tendler**

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 6-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Tendler, U.S. Patent No. 5,555,286 (“Tendler”), with claim 5 being rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tendler. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1-6 and 8-19 recite a **cordless telephone**.

The Examiner has continually ignored the plain and well known meaning of this particular language which is in ALL claims.

In particular, the Examiner cites Tendler's cellular phone as teaching a cordless telephone. The plain and true meaning of a cordless telephone is so well known to those of ordinary skill in the art that it is known to the average layperson. The language “cordless telephone” is CLEARLY a term of art, as is a “cellular telephone”. A cellular telephone is NOT a cordless telephone. Plain and simple. The Examiner’s continual allegation that a cellular phone IS a cordless telephone is frustrating and unsupported.

For instance, the cited reference of Tendler fails to even MENTION a cordless telephone, or use the word “cordless”. (This is because “cordless” has a very well known meaning in the world.) But, nevertheless, if a cellular telephone IS a cordless telephone, certainly support could be provided to show the equality between the two.

Even through this frustration, the cordless telephone as recited by claims 1-6 and 8-19 distinguishes otherwise from a cellular telephone as taught by Tendler.

In particular, claims 1-6 and 8-19 further recite a cordless telephone handset that initiates a telephone call based on receipt of a predetermined key sequence in an on-hook condition, while NOT receiving a dial tone, and without a need to manually instruct the cordless telephone to go off-hook.

Tendler appears to disclose a cellular telephone based emergency vessel/vehicle location system that includes a combined dialer and activation detector in which activation may be performed in an otherwise conventional manner, i.e., dialing a number (see, e.g., Tendler, col. 2, lines 41-42), or by way of a panic situation such as airbag deployment, intrusion detection, etc. (col. 2, lines 32-39).

The language without a need to manually instruct the cordless telephone to go off-hook has been added herein to help emphasize the distinctions of the present invention from a **cellular** telephone such as is taught by Tendler. As we all know, when dialing on a keypad of a **cellular** telephone, the call is not made until the user MANUALLY INSTRUCTS the **cellular** telephone to ‘SEND’ the telephone number with a suitable keypad button, and establish a telephone call.

The present invention does not require a user to press a SEND button. In fact, this is an important element of the present invention. For instance, see pages 1-3 of the specification where the Applicants clearly outline the problems associated largely with small children learning to dial 9-1-1 for an emergency call. The children may not necessarily learn that with a **cellular** telephone they need to dial 9-1-1-SEND, or maybe 9-1-1-CONNECT, or 9-1-1-

ON, etc., depending upon the particular brand **cellular** telephone. The present invention avoids the requirement to dial ANYTHING other than the bare digits 9-1-1 to make an emergency call.

Tendler teaches a cellular telephone that provides conventional dialing capability, which we all know requires at least one button in addition to the 9-1-1, and it's that lack of generality about what the additional button is that leaves a potentially dangerous situation with respect to children in particular.

Tendler fails to disclose, teach or suggest a **cordless telephone**, as claimed by all pending claims 1-6 and 8-19. Moreover, Tendler fails to disclose, teach or suggest a **cordless telephone handset** that initiates a telephone call based on receipt of a predetermined key sequence in an **on-hook condition**, while NOT receiving a dial tone, and **without a need to manually instruct the cordless telephone to go off-hook**, as recited by all pending claims 1-6 and 8-19.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-6 and 8-19 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

William H. Bollman  
Reg. No. 36,457

**Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC**  
2000 M Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036-3307  
TEL. (202) 261-1020  
FAX. (202) 887-0336